

# EXHIBIT D



September 30, 2024  
Page 1

VIA EMAIL

Elizabeth L. Stameshkin  
T: +1 650 843 5121  
lstameshkin@cooley.com

September 30, 2024

Amy Keller  
DiCello Levitt  
Ten North Dearborn Street, Sixth Floor  
Chicago, IL 60602

**Re:** *Kadrey, et al. v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, No. 3:23-cv-03417 (N.D. Cal.),  
Privilege Log Follow Up

Dear Amy,

As promised, we respond further to your firm's September 18 letter and our meet and confer discussions on September 24 relating to your questions regarding Meta's privilege log. We appreciate the productive nature of that call and expect to continue to work with you to resolve these issues as well as those raised by Meta regarding Plaintiffs' privilege logs. To that end, and without any waiver or admission regarding the propriety of Plaintiffs' criticisms of Meta's August 30 privilege log, we provide the following updates and responses.

As an initial matter, as a show of good faith, we plan to provide you with an updated privilege log in one week (October 7). We are open to stipulating to hold off on any briefing by both sides relating to privilege log issues (currently scheduled for Thursday, October 3) to a later date. That would allow both parties to review any revised logs and responses, and determine if open issues still exist. To that end, we need your written response to our September 25 letter concerning Plaintiffs' privilege logs, followed by updated privilege logs for Plaintiffs by October 7.

As to the other matters discussed in your letter and on our call:

First, at Plaintiffs' request, we have completed a re-review of Meta's redacted documents and completed an updated production and reproduction (which you have now received). We will revise or remove any privilege log entries relating to these documents, as appropriate.

Second, you requested on our call that we provide our updated privilege log in Excel format. We are prepared to undertake that burden, and understand that Plaintiffs will do the same for any updated or additional logs based on our call. Please confirm.

Third, on our call, you requested that we provide you with "metadata" including the subject line and filename of documents. You have not cited any case law that requires a party to do so in a privilege log and none of the Plaintiffs did so for their privilege log. Nonetheless, if doing so would help obviate motion practice, we are prepared to do that -- with the understanding that we may need to redact or remove certain subject lines or filenames if they contain information that themselves are Attorney-Client Privileged and/or Work Product. Please confirm.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



September 30, 2024  
Page 3

willing to schedule a call to talk about a reasonable number of documents and, if possible, provide more detail (e.g., if a document is a proposal provided to attorneys for review which includes attorney comments). Lastly, we would consider providing file extension information, to the extent that would be helpful.

We trust that this response will be received in the spirit of resolving any potential disputes between the parties over the privilege logs.

Very truly yours,

*/s/ Elizabeth L. Stameshkin*  
Elizabeth L. Stameshkin